



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,409	07/23/2004	Yoshiharu Uchata	10921.235USWO	3948

7590 10/29/2007
Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902

EXAMINER

REYNOLDS, STEVEN ALAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3728

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/29/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/502,409

Applicant(s)

UEHATA, YOSHIHARU

Examiner

Steven Reynolds

Art Unit

3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 8-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6 and 8-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 8/23/2007. Claims 2 and 7 were cancelled. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-17 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leenders (US 5,251,800). Leenders discloses a kit holding adapter capable of holding an analyzer for analyzing a target analyte in a sample together with a sampling tool for taking a sample, the sampling tool including an operating portion and a sampling tip, the kit holding adapter comprising: a first holding portion (52) capable of holding the analyzer; and a second holding portion (holding portion between walls 40/24 and strap 80) capable of holding the sample tool; wherein the second holding portion includes an upper opening (opening formed at the top of the strap 80) capable of exposing the operation portion of the sampling tool, and a lower opening (opening formed at the bottom of strap 80) capable exposing the sampling tip of the sampling tool; and the first holding portion includes an upper opening capable of partly exposing an analyzer, and a side opening (54) communicating with the upper opening of the first holding portion.

Regarding the intended use of the claimed invention “designed for holding an analyzer for analyzing a target analyte in a sample together with a sampling tool for taking a sample, the sampling tool including an operating portion and a sampling tip”, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Regarding claims 4 and 5, Leenders discloses the first holding portion and the second holding portion separated by a partition wall (40), the partition wall being formed with a cutout (54) for communicating an inside of the first holding portion with an inside of the second holding portion; and the first and second holding portions are integrally formed as one piece. It has been held that the term “integral” is sufficiently broad to embrace constructions united by such means as fastening and welding. *In re Hotte*, 177 USPQ 396, 328 (CCPA 1973).

Regarding claims 6, 8 and 10-15, Leenders discloses a main body integrated with the first and second holding portions capable of holding the analyzer and sampling tool; and an article holding portion (22) capable of containing articles used for at least one of the analyzer and the sampling tool, or other items used in conjunction with the sample analysis of the sampling; the article holding portion includes a plurality of containing rooms (92 and 48); the article containing portion is integrally formed with the main body as one piece; a spacer (60/90) capable of providing a spacing between an

inner surface of the first holding portion and an outer surface of an analyzer, and an inner surface of the second holding portion and an outer surface of a sampling tool; the spacer comprises a plurality of protrusions (pair of strips 60 and pad 90) projecting from the inner surfaces of the first and second holding portions; and the protrusions are bendable (made from a resilient material) when articles are inserted into the first and second holding portions; the plurality of protrusions include plural kinds (60 and 90) of protrusions having different heights; the spacer is formed of an elastic material; the analyzer can be a blood sugar measuring device; and the sampling tool can be a lancing device used for piercing a lancing element into skin.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leenders (US 5,251,800). As described above, Leenders discloses the claimed invention except for the article holding portion being removably attached to the main body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Leenders by making the article holding portion removable from the main body in order to allow the device to be taken apart for easier storage. It has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPO 177, 179.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3728

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Reynolds whose telephone number is (571) 272-9959. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on (571)272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SR

10/22/07


Mickey Yu
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700